Previous references.

1905.6.
(Sept. Rev)

File No. 173 of 02

Serial Nos. 1 - 5

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 - 5

Major **Part B. for** September 1905

SUBJECT.

Inam Claim to the Toddy Revenue of the Gokulay Samayanallur Village a Compound Table

---

1. From the Excise Commr. No. 456/235 of 11/03 Submit to the record of a pending case the above Claim.

2. To the Excise Commr. No. 630 of 23-7-1903. Returns the above for resubmission after specification of the amount advanced & awarded to the Inamdar.

3. To the Excise Commr. No. 35 of 21-7-03. Requests the return of the above rec.

G. R. S. 58

4. From the Excise Commr. No. 118 of 29-7-1905 Submits the records called for

8. To the Excise Court No. 71. 1883 of 7-9-05

Returns the records for re-transmission with the necessary corrections inserted.

21-11-14

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE

REVENUE AND GENERAL, DEPARTMENTS.

Short Office Note.

*Subject Inamdar's claim to the toddy revenue of the Coleale Sarvea Nanjamanillage, Mysore Taluk, Mysore District.

Revenue Commissioner's 4567-2 dt. 12/6/23

Note There is only a stone lat mostly in the inam village. Minute dated 9/2/24 concedes "Jetkal Rajroo" to the inamdar. The Inam title deed gives him "toddy". The inamdar has produced Muchalika from 1881. He has to prove his enjoyment. Mr. C.T. Venkatarao who investigated the claim has ~~[illegible]~~ certified the claim & the Special Commr. after perusal of all relevant rules & 2,5 & 13. Under rule 13 the amount payable annually has to be settled once for all. The qn is whether shld. both the Ex. Commr. or the Court of the Land, the amount shld be accepted from the Special Commr.

A draft admitting the claim is sent

Tru

One form may be used for more than one letter of the same file as long as there is room. Write only on side of this form. The Office Note should be in black ink.

Mysore 18/4 [illegible]

with rules

[illegible] filed.

[illegible] 2.6.03

2) The Calendar in this case does not appear to have been drawn up with sufficient care. In the column of "endings", the claim to tree-revenue is being allowed whereas the last column shows that the claim to Excise revenue is also allowed.

In the column of "amount awarded yearly", the remark is made that the amount cannot be specified as it fluctuates. The amounts to be paid under rules 2 & 5 are for past years & cannot be said to fluctuate. The only fluctuating item is the payment under Rule 13.

3) The meaning of Rule 13 is not quite clear (to me). According to the proportion there given the following working formula is obtained.

$$\text{Inam Revenue (for any year)} = \text{(Govt. revenue in that year)} \times \frac{\text{Inam popn}}{\text{Govt. popn}}$$

But it is not clear to what <u>area</u> "port revenue" & "port population" apply. Is the port population also to be a fixed quantity like the town population?

If so, then the town revenue for any year is a fixed fraction of the port revenue for that year.

16/4/03

It seems to be ~~only a rough working rule — probably~~ meant to be applied by taking the figures of each year separately. Rule 26 shows that port revenue fluctuates. Until it is shown that Rule 14 applies, it is probably meant that the figures of Census Sch. be taken for both purposes.

A report also of past amount

May we collect of the
[illegible] the [illegible]
case. [illegible]
[illegible] HW
22/4/03

4

The [illegible]
[illegible] 2nd
[illegible]

Please see the 2nd Consultation
given under date 27.4.03 the 3rd opt.

"Hermitte Letter case
Horo are the three distinguishable
from one another. The
Lieut Rao's investigation
& finding do not seem to
be quite satisfactory."

Sd/-

All these 3 cases are quite
analogous to one another.
But the Department being satisfied on
all under per the 3 cases
only when Bhio Case has
dealt with. The same
procedure now to be followed in all
these cases when they come up
[illegible] & others

similar cases that may hereafter be dealt with. None of the cases hitherto disposed of is of this nature.

Secy
4/5/03

The other 2 cases are no doubt similar to those out drawn the question arises in this case (10/4/03) & the other 5 repeat it in subsequent cases. In the fourth case (dated 24th ult.) I had a note on the peculiarness of these applications & endorsed

4/5/03

Secy.

Please put up similar draft to Govr

8/5/03

Cricd. & Secy

4/5/03

Similar draft for post b/o. I may however remark that in previous orders issued in similar

... the exact
amounts awarded were
not specified but the
amounts were left to
be adjusted under the
rules. I for one, do not
clearly understand Rule 13
... I have however no doubt
that the rules require
the investigating officer
not only to decide whether
the claimant is entitled to
a share revenue from lotteries
but also to specify the
amounts awardable under
the rules as with the all
the data before him.
The 2nd Committee has called
for an explanatory order
incorporating the above points
& shall inform me
shortly

The three drafts many

Rules
Rules have since been framed
B. Hasheem and incorporated

be returned to thanks.

7/5/03

The Dewan through the 2nd Councillor

P.C. 11/5/03

Rs 17.5.03 (1028)

Ex 136/03

From the Legislative Comte
No. 1605 dtd 29/8/05.

Refer a copy of the record relating to the Clause.

The record has been briefly given in the Legislative Comte without necessary information called for on in no 630-E.7/2.07 dtd 23/5/03

Draft submitted for approval or orders thereon

Sree 3/9/05

21 4-9-05

21 5.9.05

Passed 5/9/1905

Minute recorded 21 4-9-05

vus 4.9.05

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

E File No. 173 of 190 2

Serial No.

To the Revenue Comm.
No H 15838 dated 7 Sept 05
Returned the record
with certain observations.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

MGCPB—50,000—17-2-05

Excise Commissioner's Office
Bangalore, Dated 7th February 1903.

No. 4567/235 Encl file S.R. 173 902 SL-1

From

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of H.H. the Maharajah of Mysore, General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

In submitting herewith the records of enquiry relating to the Toddy Revenue of Goballi Inam village, Mysore taluk, I have the honor to state that I concur in the investigating Officer's opinion that the Inamdar is entitled to Excise Revenue from Toddy. There is no toddy shop in the village, but there is only a date grove. According the revenue is payable to him, subject to Rules 2, 5 and 13 in Government Proceedings No. 2074-83/R.F 166-92, dated 20 August 1901.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
S. Kantaraj Urs
for Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

Ec 242/1903

14 FEB 1903

1903

FROM The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To The Secretary to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharajah of Mysore General and Revenue Depts.

Dated 7th February 1903.

Despatched 11 — do

Received

General No. 4567

No. 235

Enclosure No. 1 file

Subject.

Submits, with his opinion, the records of enquiry relating to the Jodoy Revenue of Gohalli Inam village, Mysore Taluk.

Ecan
14.2.03

Subd with a note to Ad xfer.

Rsm
13/4/03

C.R. 17 | 87 02 | 2 | 630 | 01 | 47/12 | 23/5/13 | 11/5/13

Sl-2

Secy

The Secy to Govt
in Mysore

Mad
15.V.03
(1) Ganapathi - Mysore Sahib
(2) Timmaiah - Hunsur Sahib

Transmitted

Here with 2 other cases - How are the three distinguishable from one another? Mr Venkat Rao's interpretation & findings do not seem the quite satisfactory -

C
27/4/03

2 Hunsur
3/4

This letter no. 4567 - 2358 of 7/4 "Letters submitting the record of enquiry relating to the mandamus claim to the toddy revenue of the Gokulli Sanchammanapura village, Mysore Taluk, Mysore Dist."

In returning the enclosures herewith the undersigned ~~for perusal and consideration~~ has the honor to request that the accounts

Sd/-
All these 3 cases are quite analogous to one another but the doubt about the amount being settled once for all under rule 13 arose only when this case was dealt with. The same procedure was however meant to be followed in all these ~~cases~~ cases when they were passed back & others

recommended to the
increase for
the fourth year
under section 245
may be accelerated
& concluded, in
Column "amount if any,
recommended" of the
the Calendar &
the record presented
to Court. The
amount, if any,
recommended to the
increase should
be specified.

B.C.C

Hon

Secy

Office
20/4/03

SR 173702 dt 3

No 35/Ex 7/201

Dt 21/7/03

To

The Executive Engineer

irrigation

With reference to the letter No. S/116792 7229-48 Dt 27/28 regarding effecting recovery the amount payable to the incumbents in the establishment referred to their office letter No 629/E.7.12.01, 630/E.7.12.01 & 631/E.7.12.01 Dt 23 regarding leave not taken entered in the Calendars, has the honour to

Endorsement No 273/03 Dt 9/9/03 (Form 141)

Record fundamental note No 6443/256 Dt 10/11/04 (Form 329).

request that
the records
connected with
the claims in question
may
be returned to
this office at
an early date?

2. A separate refusal
ought to have been
sent to each of
the dockets referred
to above

R.C.

18/7/13

15/7/13

× Delays first in getting
explanations in shipping
on receipt of remits, refund
bills will be settled

15/7/13

GR 1/5 D 975 Aug 75

No. 118 Rec'd file OFFICE OF THE EXCISE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.

DATED BANGALORE, the 29th Augt. 1905.

From

P. N. Buruaiya Esquire B.A

Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To

B. K. Venkatavaradiengar Esquire

Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

As requested in your No. 35/Ex. F. 12-01 dated 21st July 1903, I have the honor to retransmit the record connected with the Inamdar's claim to the toddy revenue of Gohally village in the Mysore taluk.

2. The Bill received from the Deputy Commissioner Mysore, being wrong, it has been returned to him for correction.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

R. Gopalaiengar

for Excise Commissioner in Mysore

Gmb

G.R.S. 26]

SR 173702

Diary No. of letter replied to 975

File No. 1207

Serial No. 5

No. 7L 1583

General and Rev. Secretariat
(J. P.)
, the 7 Sept 1905.

To

The Excise Comr
in Mysore

Date of issue

Signed by W Satyanarayana (pp)

Sir,

With reference to your letter no 1188 dt 29 August 1905 forwarding the record of enquiry relating to the Inamdar's claim to the lands pursue of the Gokalli village in the Mysore Talukh, I have the honor to observe that it is clear from the extract in Colr. 729 of the Calendar that the investigating officer has made undue tendr

over.

SUBJECT.

relation between free rent ~~tenant~~ & the revenue from lands. As however, the terms of the Inam settlement & the enjoyment of the lands free from revenue for 12 years preceding the year 1892-93, are in the Inamdar's favor, the claim was considered to have been established

~~Upon this report~~ ~~in this office D.O. No 630~~ 27/12/07 ~~of 23/5/03 to ascertain~~ & ~~specify~~ the amounts payable to the Inamdar under rules 2, 5 & 13 which are applicable to the case ~~and this has remained~~ have therefore been ascertained and entered in the calendar.

~~Inam is reported to be not liable to Compensation.~~

The record prepared with your letter under reply is therefore herewith returned ~~for further action~~

List of enclosures,

Copied by

Examined by

[illegible] 5/9/1905

[illegible] 4/9/05 [illegible] 4/9/05 [illegible] 5/9/05

MGCPB—20,000-19-12—04.